

Application No.: 10/671,022  
Attorney Docket No.: 72167.000461

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 7 and 17 are amended.

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

A. The Claim Objections

The Office Action objects to claims 7 and 17 asserting minor informalities. The claims are hereby amended in response to such objections.

Withdrawal of the objection to the claims is respectfully requested.

B. The 35 U.S.C. 102 Rejection Based on Silva

In the Office Action, claims 1, 5-7, 11, 12, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S. C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0054090 by Silva et al. (Silva). This rejection is traversed.

The Office Action asserts that with respect to claim 1, Silva teaches a method for incorporating content on a web page comprising: identifying the content on a different web page (Page 4 [0031] web view allows one to specify the content on the page to be extracted from any web page); describing a structure of the content on the different web page (Page 4 [0032] structure described through Xpath); storing the described structure (Page 4 [0036] web view is saved which includes the structure); retrieving the identified content from the different webpage in real time (Page 5 [0038] content extracted); comparing a structure of the retrieved content to the stored structure (Page 5 [0042]-[0043]: mechanisms provided to detect errors related to the application of the xpath expressions against the current structure); and incorporating the retrieved content on the web page only if the structure of the retrieved content matches the stored structure

Application No.: 10/671,022  
Attorney Docket No.: 72167.000461

(Page 5 [0042]-[0043] and Page 7 [0057]: content is incorporated and displayed if no errors are detected).

Silva is directed to a method and apparatus for creating and providing personalized access to web content and services from terminals having diverse capabilities. In the Abstract, Silva teaches:

A personalized Web view of content in a Web page is created for later access by users through diverse terminals having different types of processing and display capabilities. The Web view provides a shortcut to specific content and services, which a user is interested in retrieving through limited bandwidth, high latency "thin" devices such as PDAs and WAP phones. Further, the Web view is customized to the specific type or types of devices that the user will use to access the Web view. In creating the Web view from a client terminal, a user accesses the Web page containing the information of interest either directly or by recording a series of navigation steps used to reach a final Web page from a first Web page. One or more extraction expressions for extracting the components of interest are generated and a Web view specification is created and saved at a Web view server that includes the navigation steps, the extraction expressions and an association between the extraction expressions and the specific types of devices on which the personal Web view will be displayed. When the Web view server later receives a request for the Web view from an originating device, the request includes the type of the originating device. The server then retrieves the stored specification, accesses the page indicated in the specification through the one or more navigation steps, extracts the one or more components relevant for the type of device indicated in the request, and returns the extracted components to the originating device.

Silva fails to teach the features as set forth in claim 1, and the particulars set forth therein. That is, in particular, the Office Action asserts that Silva teaches:

comparing a structure of the retrieved content to the stored structure (Page 5 [0042]-[0043]: mechanisms provided to detect errors related to the application of the xpath expressions against the current structure); and incorporating the retrieved content on the web page only if the structure of the retrieved content matches the stored structure (Page 5 [0042]-[0043] and Page 7 [0057]: content is incorporated and displayed if no errors are detected).

Application No.: 10/671,022  
Attorney Docket No.: 72167.000461

In Silva, paragraphs 0042-043 fail to teach or suggest such features as alleged in the Office Action. Rather, the noted features of the claimed invention relate to "comparing" and determining "if the structure of the retrieved content **matches** the stored structure".

In contrast, Silva, in paragraphs 0042-0043, describes "the expression will no longer retrieve the correct tables". Silva teaches that instead of absolute positions of nodes, the specification needs to include other information that helps the system uniquely identify components to be extracted, even if the node positions happen to change. Silva further teaches that if the result of applying the XPath extraction expression to the final page returns nothing, the system reports "not found".

Such teachings of Silva fail to set forth the features of claim 1 related to **comparing** and **incorporating** (if the structure of the retrieved content **matches** the stored structure). Rather, Silva relates to insuring that the extraction expressions are robust to changes in web pages.

Further, Silva teachings in paragraph 0057 fail to teach such claimed features as recited in claim 1. Silva teaches that the Web view server retrieves the requested web view from its Web view database. Also, Silva teaches that resulting content is further processed to remove uninteresting content (if any) by traversing the parsed document representation and including only the interesting parts of the tree to the document being generated. However, such teachings of Silva also fail to teach or suggest the particulars of claim 1 relating to the comparing and matching related processing.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 defines patentable subject matter for at least the reasons set forth above. Independent claims 7 and 19 define patentable subject matter for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Further, the various dependent claims define patentable subject matter based on their various dependencies on the

Application No.: 10/671,022  
Attorney Docket No.: 72167.000461

independent claims, as well as the additional features such dependent claims recite. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 is respectfully requested.

C. The 35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 2-4 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Silva in view of U.S. Patent 5,784,058 by LaStrange et al. (LaStrange). Claims 13, 14 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silva in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0021862 by Schroeder et al. (Schroeder). Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silva in view of Schroeder as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of LaStrange. Further, in the Office Action, claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silva in view of Schroeder as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,052,730 by Felciano et al. (Felciano). These rejections are traversed.

The Office Action proposes to further modify Silva based on the teachings of such further art. In particular, for example, the Office Action proposes modifications to Silva based on utilization of a new window, display of content in the new window, and the use of proscribed Uniform Resource locators (URLs), for example.

However, Applicant submits that even if it would have been obvious to modify Silva as proposed in the Office Action, which is not admitted, such modified Silva would still fail to teach or suggest the features of the claimed invention for the reasons set forth above. That is, the proposed modifications of Silva fail to cure the deficiencies of Silva as set forth above.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections are requested.

Application No.: 10/671,022  
Attorney Docket No.: 72167.000461

D. Conclusion

For at least the reasons outlined above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully solicited.

For any fees due in connection with filing this Response the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP

Dated: 6/18/07

By:

  
James B. Miner  
Registration No. 40,444

Hunton & Williams LLP  
Intellectual Property Department  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 1200  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 955-1500 (telephone)  
(202) 778-2201 (facsimile)